



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/005,174	12/04/2001	Lawrence H. Domash	A00770/70056 GSE	6902

23483 7590 11/05/2003

HALE AND DORR, LLP  
60 STATE STREET  
BOSTON, MA 02109

EXAMINER
----------

MOONEY, MICHAEL P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2877

DATE MAILED: 11/05/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/005,174

Applicant(s)

DOMASH ET AL.

Examiner

Michael P. Mooney

Art Unit

2877

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_.
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

**Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102b as being anticipated by Manasson et al. (5694498)**

Manasson et al. teaches a semiconductor film whose transmission of a first optical wavelength varies with illumination at a second optical wavelength. (Abstract; fig. 8).

Thus claim 7 is met.

**Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102b as being anticipated by Guempelein et al. (5490008).**

Guempelein et al. teaches a semiconductor film whose transmission of a first optical wavelength varies with illumination at a second optical wavelength. (Abstract; fig. 2).

Thus claim 7 is met.

Guempelein et al. teaches the semiconductor film has a refractive index at the first optical wavelength that varies with illumination as the second optical wavelength. (Abstract; fig. 2; col. 1 line 30 to col. 2 line 15). Thus claim 8 is met.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

**Claims 9, 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103a as being unpatentable**

**Guempelein et al. (5490008).**

Guempelein et al. teaches a semiconductor film whose transmission of a first optical wavelength varies with illumination at a second optical wavelength. (Abstract; fig. 2).

Guempelein et al. teaches the semiconductor film has a refractive index at the first optical wavelength that varies with illumination as the second optical wavelength. (Abstract; fig. 2; col. 1 line 30 to col. 2 line 15).

Although Guempelein et al. does not explicitly teach a diffraction grating incorporated into the semiconductor film; and a side-polished fiber coupled to the diffraction grating it would have been obvious to do so because it is notoriously well known (NWK) to use a side polished fiber with such structures.

Thus claim 9 is rejected.

By the reasons and references given above each and every element of method claims 1, 4-6 are rejected. If Applicant disagrees with this obviousness holding, then Applicant should submit evidence showing this obviousness holding is errant. Examiner will then consider restricting.

Furthermore, each and every element of claims 2-3 are rejected because the use of such devices with such an invention(s) is NWK.

If Applicant disagrees with this obviousness holding, then Applicant should submit evidence showing this obviousness holding is errant. Examiner will then consider restricting.

### ***Conclusion***


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael P. Mooney whose telephone number is 703-308-6125. The examiner can normally be reached during weekdays, M-F.


Application/Control Number: 10/005,174  
Art Unit: 2877

Page 5

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Frank G. Font can be reached on 703-308-4881. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7722 for regular communications and 703-308-7721 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956. An alternative useful number for status inquiries is 703-306-3329.

  
Michael P. Mooney  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2877

  
Frank G. Font  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2877

FGF/mpm  
10/20/03